R E P O R T  R E S U M E S

ED 012 144 FL 000 023

FOREIGN LANGUAGE CURRICULUM REPORT, SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS AND IMPLICATIONS.

BY- RYDER, FRANK G. AND OTHERS

PUB DATE 23 MAY 64

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.09 HC-$1.84 46P.

DESCRIPTORS- *MODERN LANGUAGES, *PROGRAM IMPROVEMENT, *LANGUAGE PROGRAMS, *SECONDARY SCHOOLS, *TEACHER EDUCATION CURRICULUM, CURRICULUM DEVELOPMENT, LANGUAGE LEARNING LEVELS, GROUPING (INSTRUCTIONAL PURPOSES), INDIANA, INDIANA UNIVERSITY

DESIGNED SPECIFICALLY AS A SET OF GUIDELINES FOR THE UNIVERSITY SCHOOL OF INDIANA UNIVERSITY AND OTHER SCHOOLS IN THE STATE INTERESTED IN PROGRAM DEVELOPMENT, THIS COMMITTEE REPORT CONTAINS PRINCIPLES AND RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING FOREIGN LANGUAGE CURRICULUMS AND TEACHER TRAINING. MAJOR SECTIONS IN PART I DEAL WITH THE GOALS OF FOREIGN LANGUAGE LEARNING, APPROACHES TO INSTRUCTION, GROUPING PRACTICES WITHIN A VARIED-LEVEL SEQUENCE, EXPERIMENTAL PROGRAMS, ADVANCED PLACEMENT PROGRAMS, INSTRUCTIONAL MATERIALS AND DEVICES, PROGRAM ADMINISTRATION, DEVELOPMENT OF CONTINUITY AND LEVELS, AND FLES STUDY. PART II DISCUSSES RECOMMENDATIONS FOR IMPROVING TEACHER PREPARATION, PRACTICE TEACHING, AND CERTIFICATION PROCEDURES. (AM)

ED012144

Indiana Language Program
Lindley Hall 101
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 4740

# FL CURRICULUM REPORT

## Summary of Recommendations and Implications

(in order of appearance in main text)

May 23, 1964

Basic

1. Raise standards in important areas of curriculum and teacher training.
2. Take the concept of "language" in its broadest sense, giving full weight to all elements.

Specific

1. Define ultimate goals of the new "full sequence" of FL instruction.
2. Capitalizing on progress in audio-lingual aspects, reinforce writing and reading as "neglected" skills.
3. Hold clearly to audio-lingual approaches in grades, up to grade 5.
4. Read advanced literary and cultural material at least in last year or two of HS.
5. Discuss literature, etc., <u>in</u> the FL, as much as possible.
6. Cover new instructional materials (ALM, etc.) more rapidly than is now the practice.
7. Explore patterns of "continuous instruction," an approach congenial to FL.
8. Consider carefully the problem of transfer students.
9. Place students (including transfers) by tests and measurements, not by grade-level.
10. To the limit of feasibility, put students of different age in the same class, by achievement.
11. Free up the pattern of class size, etc.
12. Encourage new Advanced Placement Programs.
13. Control carefully the training of teachers who will work with AP.
14. Plan for maximum opportunities for placement in college, by use of CEEB tests, etc.
15. Study available programmed instruction, and do some experimenting in programmed learning.

FL 000 023

16. Expand other avenues of self-instruction.

17. See that all instructional adjuncts are clearly related to and subordinated to the teacher.

18. Open foreign study (e.g. Honors Program) to more HS students.

19. Be alert to the chance for government and foundation help in many areas.

20. Set up administration to cover whole span of FL teaching, not breaking it into ES and HS, for example.

21. Keep the teacher free of routine administration.

22. In all possible school systems, appoint a supervisor for FL, and avoid conventional "chairmen."

23. Make every program continuous, all the way through to grade 12, without breaks; no lacunae, no "second starts."

24. Consider starting FLES in grade 4 or 5, rather than holding rigidly to 3.

25. Make FLES a required subject, when it is offered. Elective status may start in JHS (if the school is on an elective basis).

26. Watch distribution and variety of language offerings, so that one language does not prosper at the expense of others, and so that more that one language is available to able students.

27. Be aware of (but not frightened by) the expense of long FL programs.

28. Provide alternative starting points for extreme divergences of age and ability, e.g. ninth grader with no FL, who can't enter with grade 4 beginners.

29. Hold to faith in FLES but upgrade the effort and speed progress. Specifically "compress" the number of years required for Level I and Level II.

30. Redefine Level VI or create a level VII.

31. Make FLES in general more efficient and substantial.

32. Increase classroom time devoted to FLES.

33. Arrange conference to make detailed restatement of "Levels," and work to be done in each.

(Teacher Training)

34. Make residence and study abroad possible for every FL teacher.

35. Cultivate and recognize the American-born FL teacher.

36. Arrange schedules for methods course and student teaching to facilitate study abroad.

37. Consider Indiana-Purdue centers for foreign study as a base of operations for prospective teachers.

38. Look into other possible sources of aid (Consortium, Armed Forces Program).

39. Consider other functions for American teachers abroad (Lektor positions, teaching exchanges, seminars with local teachers).

40. Get all institutions training teachers to provide a full four years of work in language courses (conversation, diction, writing, etc.)

41. Similarly, urge expansion of literature courses or sections taught in the FL.

42. Recognize differences of difficulty among commonly taught FLs.

43. Reexamine programs of Area concentration as fields for prospective teachers.

44. Recognize courses like H 453 French Art (to be given in French, in the fall) or the proposed history courses taught in FL as part of the regular program for teachers (including certification).

45. Expand the present Methods Course.

46. Get every FL department in the University to offer 8-week courses (methods, etc.) to complement practice teaching and the Methods Course.

47. Keep methods courses and practice teaching in proper sequence.

48. Examine the possibility of weekly seminars for practice teachers in the field.

49. Supervise practice teaching in the field until "master teachers" are really masters.

50. Extend the practice of certification by examination as well as by courses taken — using such tests as the MLA (but only those MLA tests measuring the basic areas of proficiency, not the "professional" ones).

Indiana Language Program
Lindley Hall 101
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401



# The Curriculum

## I. General

This report, in final form, is the result of our attempt to set up guidelines for a program of instruction in foreign languages for the University School and for any other schools interested or affected, together with indications of the sort of training appropriate to a teacher instructing in such a program.

The report is expressed more in the form of suggestions and principles than in detailed prescription. The heads of language work, the teachers and the principals must have freedom to work out the specific approaches.

In the most general terms, we suggest a further raising of standards in both the FL curriculum and the training of teachers, and the broadest possible understanding of the nature of foreign language.

In the past, major directions or movements in language teaching and other branches of learning have been characterized, and probably aided, by a summative name: the direct method, the audio-lingual approach, the new math. What we are proposing is a unified program of foreign language instruction and teacher training centering on "the whole language." If we were in search of a name, this would probably be it.

As a tentative statement of the goals we envision as attainable at the conclusion, in grade 12, of a program begun in grade 3, 4, or 5, we offer the following--with awareness of its partial nature:

A working control of one foreign language. Within reasonable limits the ability to

1. Understand everyday speech (the standard language), in

natural situations, sufficiently well to be able to get along in the foreign country after no more than a week's adjustment.

2. Understand prepared speech (lectures, reports) at moderate tempo, on topics of reasonable seriousness and intellectual content; also at least the gist of a movie.
3. Participate in a class in another subject (History, for example) conducted largely or entirely in the foreign language.
4. Speak well enough to handle any normal situation (in terms of 1 above).
5. Prepare a talk on a serious subject and deliver it with only moderate errors in accent, inflections, or syntax.
6. Read informal materials (letters, etc.) without help; and literature, newspapers, expository material with a dictionary--used only infrequently except for unusually difficult or exotic material.
7. Write on a level somewhat higher than that contemplated in 4 and 5, with no egregious mistakes.
8. Appreciate literary and cultural materials of standard difficulty (no more than two years "behind" materials dealt with in English courses) with a basic sense of style, levels of discourse, etc.
9. Discuss such materials in the foreign language with recourse to English only for technical terms or considerable subtleties.
10. Understand something of the contrastive structures of English and the FL -- as intellectual content, not only as Sprachgefühl.

(We recognize that these goals must be modified to accord with the varying difficulty for the English speaker of the commonly offered

languages. One cannot read Camus and Pushkin with equal ease.)

2. Relation to previous statements of policy

In various circles throughout the country there has been an indication of a desire to develop an effective methodology for a faster transition from straight audio- lingual work to other aspects of language. The writing of foreign languages needs to be strengthened, and the reading of worthwhile literary and cultural materials can be introduced, with careful attention to linguistic difficulties, during the third level of high school instruction. Primary attention would, at that level, be devoted to language rather than to literary appreciation or analysis of cultural features, but this would allow students to make initial contacts and, at succeeding levels, move on to consideration of content. With the establishment of higher standards in the spoken language, particularly for teachers, we have made a substantial start toward rectifying major short-comings of earlier instruction. If we now make a concerted effort to define foreign language teaching as a totality we may well do language instruction a substantial further service. This statement of policy is basic to our whole view of language instruction. It is not immune to misunderstanding, however, and we must take pains to point out what we mean and what we do not mean. Our goal is not to withdraw from ground already occupied but to push on. We do not propose that teachers deemphasize or cut short their audio-lingual work in order to return to older or more traditional approaches, however defined. We do propose that they move <u>on,</u> carrying audio-lingual abilities into new areas, talking about structural problems in the language, demanding written work (and correcting it) in the foreign language, reading and discussing worthwhile materials, literary or broadly cultural, in the language--as far as humnaly possible. That there are difficulties here, we concede. Many teachers do not yet use newer materials easily or effectively--or they take an excessively

doctrinaire view of them. There is little help, in the form of glossaries or "methodology" for the teacher who wants to do either grammar or literary and cultural discussion in the language he is teaching. An effort must be made to remedy these more specific shortcomings, but the principal wider goal must also remain in sight.

The first stages of a ten-year program should remain primarily audio-lingual. The groundwork can be laid for good pronunciation habits, for effective use of foreign language patterns, and for the understanding of the spoken language. By an early grouping of students according to levels of linguistic competence, the program can be strengthened for students with special abilities, and slower students can be given the time needed to achieve a desirable level of competence. By the third year of a ten-year sequence, it seems not only possible but mandatory to introduce reading and writing in the course for the faster students. Such study can have a stimulating effect. Activities related to elementary reading and writing as well as a continuation of audio-lingual instruction would make a lengthening of the period of daily instruction at that level highly desirable. Building on such a foundation, there seems no reason why instruction at the fourth or fifth level and higher should not address itself to the reading and discussion of fairly advanced literary and cultural matter. The whole program of College Board Advanced Placement is based upon this assumption, and its achievements have been considerable.

In all of this it is understood that as much as possible of the discussion of literature and culture be done in the foreign language. Here again the advantages of better audio-lingual training will be apparent. It is important to stress that at different levels we must have different emphasis, stressing the particular aspect of language which is appropriate to that level. This is

a familiar feature of major policy statements, from Brooks on. We propose only a certain shift of emphasis and proportion. Within the framework of elementary and high school language it seems perfectly possible to aim, over the whole program, at a broad, diversified, and highly useful mastery of the foreign language.

There is a good deal of misunderstanding of the actual nature of the so-called audio-lingual materials even among the teachers who use them. Properly handled, these teaching materials contemplate the introduction of reading and writing, but teachers must realize this and must be trained to use the materials efficiently. One of the commonest faults in the handling of such material--some of this may inhere in the material itself, but not all--is that because of the large mass involved, less work is actually covered than was the case with either the so-called traditional or the relatively modern "two-year unit" books. It is clear that many teachers do not have an adequate sense of the limitations of the material on the one hand or of the possibilities of extension on the other. The frequent result of the dropping of so-called standard texts and the adopting of, for example, the AIM books is that the students in a sequence of given length are left a good deal farther behind in terms of some of the standard measuring devices than they were before. This should not be. Teachers need help in evaluating the texts they are using and in choosing supplementary materials that will lead to a more complete language program.

Our coverage of necessary materials for instruction is greatly aided by the various guides and lists of materials which are available both for foreign languages in elementary schools and for the high school programs. Notable among these lists are those of the MLA and that of the Office of Education. In each case, lists are kept resonably up to date, and it is important that teachers

know about them and be able to use them, recognizing that with careful selection of supplementary material, their courses can be strengthened.

With an adequate understanding of the nature of available materials and of necessary goals in foreign language teaching, there is no substantial reason why our work, as it progresses through the "levels," should be restricted to exclusive approaches: strictly writing or non-writing, strictly audio-lingual or reading. What we must aim at is setting up a reasonable target for accomplishment both in graded and, of course, in non-graded or individually paced programs.

3. The possibility of "continuous instruction"

In some, if not most, of its major aspects, foreign language learning is remarkably cumulative, not composed of discrete fields or parts. It is not by its nature a respecter of grade-step divisions. In this fact lies a positive stimulus to experiments in non-graded or continuous instruction.

In another facet of the program of the FL instruction lies a negative or external impetus in the same direction. The better and longer our instructional program, the more differing levels of competence will be generated among pupils within the sequence. More serious still, there are always different schools, and pupils do transfer among them. We shall therefore soon have to develop instructional patterns to fit an enormous range of preparation. Put at the extreme: Students will be coming into the high school level of foreign language with anything from 5 years of previous preparation down to absolutely nothing. The whole system of grade steps or units in a given subject, the whole concept of "beginning French," of the identification of courses by name or number or letter, all of these will be automatically called into question, or will be literally impossible. A feasible substitute will have to be found in the form of a system flexible enough to absorb students, from within or without the school system, at any of several stages. (There is a limit of difference beyond which continuous instruction probably cannot absorb the extremes. We shall try to deal later in this report with areas beyond that limit.) Some other measure will also have to be found by which to express the level of attainment of the high school student, either for internal purposes or for college admissions.

It is evident that we shall have to work toward statements of level of competence as the ultimate expression of "what the student has had."

Here again it seems wise not to make exact prescription as to how programs should run. In many cases there simply is neither enough experimental background nor enough practice to warrent such a statement anyway. We wish, however, to stress the existence of these urgent problems in many schools right now, in virtually all schools in the relatively near future. Answers seem to lie along a more or less predictable line. As the level of preparation becomes increasingly varied, from student to student within the same age group, it is probable that we shall have to develop more individualized instruction, a pattern of teaching that contemplates in some areas of the subject large groups, in other areas small groups, and finally a well developed sequence of self-instructional programs and devices.

It seems fair to say that within certain certain limits we will have more and more groupings which contain for example some 12 year olds and some 9 year olds, brought together because they are roughly at the same stage of language preparation in Spanish, for example. Clearly the degree of sophistication with which early dialogue materials can be presented may vary enough so that it will be impracticable to put a very young fourth grader together with a rather mature eighth grader. On the other hand, we shall have to move in this direction a good deal more than we are presently doing.

Even in the setup of programs for language instruction it seems wise to point out that a single system, a single program or programmed text, for example, is scarcely the answer to our problem. The range of abilities and the range of motivation is such that we shall

probably have to look toward multiple groups running along at different speeds and even with substantially different approaches, to meet the varying needs of the fast student, the slow student, the verbally apt, or the taciturn, the younger learner or the more mature.

Clearly the standard classroom with its restricted number of seats does not lend itself to instruction in large groups, yet it seems quite certain that there are aspects of foreign language instruction, from films to choral work to explanation of certain linguistic phenomena, which can best be presented in groups larger than normal classroom size. Schools and teachers should be urged to experiment in the direction of a far greater flexibility in all of these respects. We cannot give specific programs or outlines which we will recommend to the exclusion of others. All that we can do is to point to the problems as they exist or will soon exist, and to certain possibilities of solution, or to examples of plans actually in practice which may meet our new problems. Much experimentation is now going on elsewhere in this state, and of course in the University Schools.

We wish to emphasize the fact that, despite the differing size and concentration of language programs, most of these problems which to some teachers and administrators seem relatively remote are actually with us right now. Fortunately it may well be that the foreign languages offer a relatively favorable situation for the development of solutions. There are of course fields of instruction which have never followed the lock step of formal grade and age division. Examples are music and art. Among the fields which will have to be renovated, foreign languages have a great advantage in providing relatively clear continua of materials in which one can build more or less directly

upon previous attainment, without a great deal of differentiation as to divisions within the subject. The problem is probably even easier than that of mathematics, for example, although that field too has its strong "cumulative" aspects. Further, a general openness to experimentation and new methods and approaches is by now almost endemic in the foreign language area.

4. Other special and experimental programs.

An important segment of foreign language instruction is that represented by the experimental programs or advanced programs which can be introduced in schools ambitious to improve their teaching. One example, and an obvious and important one, is the Advanced Placement Program. At the present writing, there appear to be only four high schools in the state which are directly affiliated with the Advanced Placement Program. UHS has programs currently in operation in French and Spanish and may add Russian. There is no question that such affiliation is attractive both to the students and to the institutions themselves. The results, in the event of a score of five or four or even three, are important in terms of placing a student high in his college or university. Pressure for the introduction of such programs should be met, but only if a satisfactory teacher can be found. This latter is a sine qua non. The nature of these programs, with their heavy emphasis on the reading and criticism of literature, makes it imperative that the teachers be unusually well informed and trained. In the UHS Program help was available from professors at the University itself, but this, of course, cannot be counted on in every high school.

In connection with the Advanced Placement program it would seem

wise to mention one reservation we feel. In this program a relatively specific and restricted curriculum is contemplated as the basis of instruction and testing. There is a legitimate question in German, for example, whether the program is not unduly concentrated on the classical period and the nineteenth century. This is not directly within the scope of our recommendations, but it would seem possible to stress the advisability of some change in the direction of more modern literature. Further, many capable students might be interested in doing more serious advanced language work as a background for other professions if there were a possibility for other areas of emphasis in the Advanced Placement Program, for example, general scientific or biographical readings in German, historical and cultural studies in Spanish on Latin America.

Another aspect of advanced placement is the area which is not defined by the Advanced Placement Program itself. We refer to the possibility, which is open to students in any high school with a good language program, of getting advanced placement on the basis of tests given locally or at the institutions to which the students go. For example, at Indiana, which accepts CEEB tests given locally and administers its own as well, it is clearly possible for students to be placed in the second semester of first year, in some part of second year, or even in third and fourth year courses directed either toward language or toward literature. Attention should be drawn here to the advisability that every high school expand its use of CEEB Achievement Tests (or, possibly, other national tests). These tests are widely recognized for placement, and their use obviates taking the tests at the colleges, in crowded orientation periods, and after a summer of lying fallow. Placement of this sort

is naturally gratifying to any high school and, of course, most of all to the student who receives it. At UHS, for example, out of about 118 seniors going into colleges and universities, more than 40 received advanced placement, often with corresponding credit, at the individual colleges and universities to which they were admitted. Clearly, as

foreign language instruction becomes more effective and reaches farther down into the grade schools, this will become a dominant theme in the programs themselves and in college admissions. (The implications of advanced placement for the problem of teacher training and of curricular planning in universities should be taken up by this or succeeding committees.)

A final area concerns more strictly experimental programs. The whole field of programmed instruction is wide open. Languages lend themselves, in a degree almost equal to mathematics, to instruction by teaching machines, or by programmed textbooks. It is obviously one of the functions of UHS to be active as a pilot institution for such programs, and it is to be hoped that this will be the case. The status of materials now available for programmed instruction, however, gives us some pause. No acceptable FL program has been devised and marketed, although it must be admitted that good results can occasionally be achieved by less than perfect programs. (We suspect too that a little exploration would uncover a good deal in the way of current experimental work underway or finished elsewhere. The openings for us and for the high schools of this state lie particularly in the development of and experimentation with such programs, and even in the devising of programs themselves. As more programs for teaching machines and programmed texts become available, the field will, of course, be opened even wider. The relevance of such programs lies not only in the improvement of instruction in general but in the very great importance which self-instructional systems assume as differences of student preparation and ability increase. Clearly, the more effective our instruction is, and the more opportunities there are for development of ability in foreign languages, the more

our students will begin to differ from one another within the same grade. As these differences begin to accumulate, we shall obviously face a problem which can (within limits) be handled most simply by recourse to self-instructional devices and to other "secondary" aspects of language instruction.

While we are emphasizing the potential inherent in self-instructional devices and in programmed materials, we feel it necessary also to caution the people who will read our report that there are inherent difficulties as well as temporary ones. Among the temporary ones is of course the perilous state, already alluded to, of programs now available in the foreign languages. This will presumably be remedied in the future. More fundamental is the possibility of boredom and inefficiency which lies in the exclusive use of a programmed body of material, when it appears by itself and must try to supply its own internal motivation. Indeed, the same applies even to that ancestor of modern instructional adjuncts in our field: the language laboratory. Clearly any such "aids" rest for their ultimate success upon a proper combination with the teacher. This is not just the conventional observation that the teacher is irreplaceable. It involves a reasonably distinct separation of function, so that the routine teaching of skills is done to some considerable degree by programs and self instructional devices, while the stimulus toward application of this knowledge in all sorts of practice with foreign language (ranging from free conversation to writing letters abroad to the analysis of textual materials) will remain the province of the teacher. The stimulus which comes from this use of the skills attained will itself be the greatest motivation for the continued attack on the mechanics of language learning. The teacher stands

at the borderline where the predictable and mechanized materials of instruction end and the wider horizons of actual use in the highest sense begin.

We wish to point to a final major area of experimentation. This is the opening of foreign study, suitably organized and supervised, to high school students. Both the Honors Program (in St. Brieuc, Krefeld and Oaxaca) and Mrs. Leo Dowling's summer trips show this principle already at work. As we develop greater and greater competence among our students, we virtually owe them — or the best of them — some such opportunity.

In many lesser ways, productive experimentation is possible. One project which seems to hold out a good deal of hope is the creation at UHS of a so-called language alcove where electronic devices of one kind or another can be set up and made available to students. Tapes and records, particularly for voluntary work, would be available, and illustrative materials of all kinds bearing on cultural and literary aspects of the language and country would constantly be on hand.

It should not be overlooked that in a great deal of this sort of undertaking, as well as in labs, government help in the form of matching funds is available. In later paragraphs we shall mention the financial aspect of the extension of foreign language work. This area of auxillary materials is inevitably a fairly costly one. Thus, the accumulation of added budget from government sources becomes a particularly important part of the high school's planning.

5. Administrative structures.

We do not intend to make specific recommendations as to one kind of structure or another. Our forbearance is due not only to our

recognition of differing size and pattern of administration in the various elementary schools and high schools, but more importantly to our desire to leave the individual school free to devise its own pattern of administration—which it is probably going to do anyway. In the matter of general aims and goals on the other hand we wish to make a strong statement. Individual schools and administrations would, we hope, do their best to devise structures which will serve the attainments of these goals. Aims which any administrative set-up would facilitate and encourage:

a. There should be an unrestricted and stimulating flow of ideas across the entire spectrum of language offerings from the elementary through the secondary level. The problem is a single and integral one and it should be approached with this in mind. Full communication and the development of a consistent and continuing policy is essential to the welfare of foreign language instruction from the bottom to the top. No separate administrative stages should be set up which would interrupt this continuum.

b. The teacher should be involved in such matters of administration as are directly connected with questions of policy, not however with matters of detail. This is particularly important in devising a workable arrangement for the language laboratory. Any teacher who is in charge of finding or devising materials for laboratory instruction should have the equivalent of one class removed from his regular schedule. As a corollary, we should urge that no teacher be assigned routine jobs like the identification of machines needing repair, the arrangements of special electronic jobs like

projecting, or scheduling, or filing of records and materials. It is true that if no one is made responsible for these details, the laboratory as an instructional device will falter. On the other hand it is equally clear that student help is available and is often fully capable as far as machinery, specifically and metaphorically, is concerned. What students cannot do or should not do, can be handled by secretarial staff. The teacher remains free to concern himself with matters of policy, selection, and organization.

c. In any system large enough to warrant it--and we should like to urge that all schools take a broad view of this issue--there should be a supervisor for foreign language instruction. We are interested in maintaining a high level of openness to new approaches, to experimentation, and to the developing of effective teaching methods. There are of course school systems which are too small to set up any such pattern of supervision. In these, we suggest that the chairman of the foreign language department or of one of the foreign languages, or, if there is no such structure, the teacher responsible for one of the more active programs take over the responsibility for such a job -- not only in his own school but in other schools in the district. The head of languages now being hired for the University schools will serve as a model for this sort of activity, but of course only to the extent that other school systems can hope to mount as large and intensive program as that which will characterize the University School.

This person will not only teach in one of the language programs but also be responsible for the general setting of policy and direction in foreign languages. His job will not be a static one but may well change from semester to semester or year tc year.

Schools should be cautious about establishing a conventional "chairman" of the foreign language department. The risk is not only the familiar one, that of developing a stultifying dictatorship, it is compounded by the fact that such positions often go on the basis of seniority to an older, established teacher who may not be cognizant of modern trends and issues.

d. A central question in recent studies in foreign language instruction, as well as in practical experimentation, is that of foreign language in elementary school. In this area it seems incumbent upon our committee to take a clear stand. The commencement of elementary school programs in foreign language at grade 3 was a prominent feature of early recommendations; it still is a feature of many. Yet it is by no means clear that there is anything inevitable about beginning in that grade. Indeed there has already been serious reaction in various parts of the country, engendered particularly when programs optimistically commenced in the 3rd grade found themselves with no possibility of continuation in the later grades and thus came under strong pressure from disillusioned parents and schoolboards. The basic plan which has been followed in the University School and under the ILP seems

far sounder: to extend work back from the high school, where it was already established, down into the grades so that at any given time there is a complete continuity of language instruction. It is infinitely more important to be sure there is unbroken continuity from <u>wherever</u> you start, even if it is 10th grade, than it is to make an arbitrary, optimistic beachhead in 3rd or any other early grade. When University School starts its French program in the 4th grade it will have a continuing series of courses running all the way thru the end of high school.

e. The consensus in the committee was clearly in the direction of foreign language as a required study if it is offered in the grades. Some students will doubtless drop out of the program because of lack of ability, but this is a factor in almost any subject area. In those junior high school programs which offer electives it may be possible to give a beginning foreign language as a voluntary subject but this possibility will have to be examined with considerable care. In high school, the offerings should be as broad as possible, even to the point of including the more exotic languages.

f. It seems clear that in setting up the ideal program of language instruction we often concentrate, for the sake of presenting a theory or model, on offerings in a single language. Translated into actual practice, this may have a deleterious effect. In certain areas of the country, the choice automatically falls on Spanish, in others on

French, and the extension of offerings into the grades may result in a considerable improvement in one language but a definite deterioration in all others. Thus we must keep in mind the position of second or third languages in the grade school and high school curriculum which we are examining. This is of particular bearing on German and Russian, because of their relative rarity in the curriculum.

In general, we should take a positive position in support of more than one foreign language as the eventual goal not only of long sequence instruction in high schools (already attained in larger and more forward-looking schools) but also of individual students, particularly the more able.

g. A fact which we must not overlook is the expense of curricular changes in the direction of longer foreign language programs. Much more is implied than simply the addition of a new teacher. The earlier a program commences the more it demands in cumulative time, as successive generations of students enter the program. The amount of money that has to be spent for language laboratories and so on is by no means negligible. Both schoolboards and administrations must be clearly aware of the general dimiensions of the financial problem, but also of the aid available, for example from NDEA.

6. Situations requiring different starting points for FL, with final remarks on certain implications for FLES.

In the conclusion of this section on the curriculum we must direct our attention to two of the crucial (and most troublesome) problems of FL instruction. We have already indicated that there is an effective limit beyond which a pattern of continuous instruction cannot absorb students with differing levels of preparation and competence. What we take as a

solution to t' .s dilemma raises most clearly the whole issue of the aims of a program starting in grade 3 or 4.

Unless some other and preferable means can be devised to solve the problem of transfer students with widely divergent backgrounds entering the 4-12 continuum, it may be necessary to operate with a variant of the "track" system. Such a system might be arranged as follows. (We use the conventionally understood concepts of "levels," but with crucial differences, as will be apparent.)

1. Students who enter the continuum at grade 4 and remain in the school would progress from Level I to Level VI or VII in grades 4-12. Progress would depend upon achievement of desired terminal behavior for each level--demonstrated preferably through objective measuring and evaluation.
2. Transfer students entering the sequence of courses would be placed according to an objective testing device.
3. Those with no previous study of FL would need to start at Level I. However, if a seventh grade student were to begin the FL at Level I, the level of maturity among students in grade 4 (Level I) and the type of material used in grade 4 would preclude entrance of the seventh grader into the basic beginning group. It may be necessary to have another track beginning in grade six or seven. The same, regrettably, may long be true at grade 9 or even 10.
4. During elementary grade levels, it would be desirable to have a further breakdown. For example, a two or three year

sequence for the coverage of Level I might be broken into five or six sub-levels into which students could be placed when entering the school, and through which they could advance according to ability. This is done in other elementary school subjects within a classroom. A possible system of tracks is as follows:

| | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4) 5) | Level I x) | | | | |
| 6) 7) | Level II | | 6) 7) | Level I | |
| 8) 9) | Level III | | 8) 9) | Level II | |
| 10) | Level IV | | 10) | Level III | 9) Level I |
| 11) | Level V | | 11) | Level IV | 10) Level II |
| 12) | Level VI | | 12) | Level V | 11) Level III |
| | | | | | 12) Level IV |

Alternate (with same suggestions for grades 4-7 as above):

| | | | |
|---|---|---|---|
| 8) 9) | Level III | 8) 9) | Level II |
| 10) | Level IV | 10) | Level III |
| 11) | Level V | 11) | Level IV |
| 12) | Level VI | 12) | Level V |

x) It may well be that one year should be added to Level I here, for the average or below-average student. The scheme as given would be suitable for the stronger student. Attention would also have to be given to the question whether the program from grade 7 on (in the long sequence) should be elective and selective--except for students new to the community and consequently unable to start at an earlier point.

Average and below average students might also need three years beginning in grade six to master one level.

Anyone familiar with the system of "levels" established by Nelson Brooks and repeated or only slightly changed in dozens of succeeding treatments will recognize substantial differences. These differences stem from strongly held views of the committee.

One scarely needs to be a Cassandra to say that not all is well with FLES. There are many schools where the program is under pressure, both for reasons internal to it and from outside forces. The latter often appear in the form of strong demands for other fields--early math, for example--which have both powerful reasons and great appeal. They cannot be shrugged off. Nor can the internal difficulties, which are not always so patently obvious as the problem of finding the highly specialized and qualified teachers necessary to the program.

We believe that the reasons for and the advantages of teaching foreign languages in the elementary school are substantial, indeed

unassailable. We do not believe that our schools have, in general, confirmed this. Much more needs to be done. The second purpose of our chart of "levels" is to present our conviction that, in substance, we should raise our sights—and that this is the best way to a viable and enduring FLES program.

Tha classic statement of levels, following Nelson Brooks' pioneering book, envisions Level I occupying grades 3-6, with Level IV reached at grade 10. For a pupil starting in grade 9, Level IV comes at 12th grade. In the former case, it takes eight years to reach the stage arrived at by the latter in four. The contradiction is apparent:

If language teaching is as much more efficient and effective in earlier years as we say it is, the early starter should get much farther ahead. If he doesn't, something is wrong—either with the principle behind FLES or the application of it.

Something is also wrong if we are confronted with this situation: A transfering pupil with no French comes, at seventh grade level and age, into a program where French has been taught since grade 3. Having no starting course in grade 7, the principal or teacher puts him in with the class which has had four years of French and says, "Well, he'll pick it up quite fast." If he does, the class hasn't been learning much in those four years.

Something is also wrong when after three years of FLES the pupils are still, basically, singing "Sur le pont" and playing roughly the same little games. This reduplication of trivial matter is not worthy of FLES or our children. True, children in grades three and four cannot be expected to do the homework or intensive study that junior and senior

high students can do. To some extent it is justifiable to spend more time in teaching songs and taking part in activities that will give them a feeling for culture at the child's level, even though it will not advance them linguistically as rapidly as structural drills. Such activities are valuable in stimulating interest and in broadening cultural knowledge. But there must be both substantial learning and noticeable progress. (The pathetically small allotment of time is <u>in part</u> responsible for the failure to advance. What can we expect from 15 minutes a day, three days a week?)

If such situations remain uncorrected, we can be reasonably sure that FLES will not long survive.

To repeat, we believe in FLES. What we urge is a raising of standards. Our charts show the results in two forms:

1. A far less diffuse and prolonged Level I, with an upward <u>redefinition</u> of Level VI; or
2. A less diffuse and prolonged Level I and the addition of a Level VII, as the end point for those who have the advantage of starting in the early grades.

The "level" concept is certainly not the only one susceptible of such improvement. In a pattern of continuous instruction without grade-steps, it might be even easier to progress to the full measure implied in the true potential of FLES. Levels make the point more obvious.

To attain a more effective FLES program we propose:

1. A stepping up of pace and standards (the hardest to gain, yet the most important).
2. An increase, in grades 3 and 4, to daily sessions of at least 15-25 minutes, in 5 and 6 to 25 minutes, in 7 and 8 to 30 or 35 minutes, and in 9 to full periods, as in other subjects. If it is necessary to provide a special "track" for slower students, Level I and II might occupy only 15 - 20 minutes a day (and take longer).

2. Redefinition of "levels"

For either a grade-step sequence or continuous instruction, a systematic definition of levels, in terms of performance and capacities to be attained at the end of each level, is essential. It has never been done, hence to speak of "redefinition" is sanguine.

We do not ourselves propose to undertake such a task. Our recommendation is that this be the working assignment of a group of practicing teachers and "teacher trainers," active in the field.

(With due respect, we do not feel we have as much to gain from some of the established theoreticians whose doctrine is clearly and somewhat repetitively on the record, as we do from people here. The latter constitute one of the major "concentrations of talent" in the country. We do suggest securing the cooperation of a few outsiders.)

If a larger "conference" tackles our problem we suggest therefore that, starting with the principles and assumptions of this report, it seek to produce a full statement of "levels": content, aims, testing, etc. We feel that this would be a major service to FL teaching in America. It would give us, finally, a clear and detailed indication of reasonably manageable content and attainable goals, for each level, in all aspects of language learning: phonological, lexical, morphological, syntactic, in speaking, understanding, reading, and writing.

Such review implies a careful examination of testing and measuring. Few national tests are now available for elementary school foreign language, even in the highest grades. We need a full set of "graded" tests, with carefully established norms. The advantage of such a set of measures, in placement, rapid advancement, final examination, grading, and so on can scarcely be overstated. It should be possible to create or adapt a set of criteria for students, parallel to the MLA's "minimal," "good," and "superior" as general rating along with specific scores.

A final and, unhappily, related point. If we gain a new and tenable set of aims or "terminal standards" for our various levels, we may encourage the writing and publishing of more nearly suitable texts. Too often "policy" is really made by textbook selection,

whatever the assumed goals and standards are. And too often the sequence of available texts is full of gaps and highly repetitious. We "start" with new (perhaps faster) beginning books, over and over again. These are in large part false starts and wasted time.

Some of these latter points look increasingly far into the future and are less immediately within the province of the committee but they are no less important. We urge their consideration.

Indiana Language Program
Lindley Hall 101
Indiana University
Bloomington, Indiana 47401

II

## Teacher Training Program

Two developments in education are forcing colleges and universities to reexamine their programs for the preparation of language teachers: the rapid exaansion of information related to the teaching and learning of modern foreign languages, and a drastic upward revision in levels of competence expected or required. In most areas of the country, public school demands for foreign language instruction with current methods and materials have created additional pressures for "modernization" of training. Although the program of N.D.E.A. summer institutes has done a remarkable job in providing remedial work for about 14,000 foreign language teachers, it can only be considered a temporary and partial measure. The job must be done before the prospective teacher leaves college.

Areas in which most of our foreign language teachers, even those recently graduated, appear to be deficient are the following:

1. Audio-lingual skills in the foreign language. (This does not imply unqualified satisfaction with their writing and reading).
2. Aspects of the foreign culture from the anthropological level to contemporary social and political problems.
3. Knowledge of the nature of language.
4. Understanding of the structural differences or "linguistic" differences between native and "target" language.
5. Knowledge of the psychology of language learning.
6. Acquaintance with professional aspects of language teaching: organizations, resources, services, etc.
7. Familiarity with the tools of modern instruction in foreign language: audio-visual devices, electro-mechanical devices (language laboratories, etc.), new materials, "programmed" courses.

8. Preparation of materials: programming, preparation of tests, tape recording.

9. Effective approaches to the study of literary works, including the use of the foreign language in discussion and writing.

To meet and overcome these points of weakness, and, speaking positively, to provide teachers who can with effectiveness and competence guide the sort of program we have outlined, we propose a number of special approaches. These are to be taken as supports and extensions of a strong basic education, not as substitutes for it.

1. Residence and study abroad for every teacher of FL.

All of us are agreed that the foreign language teacher should have in the course of his preparation at least one semester or summer of intensive language study abroad. This is particularly important in bringing up to an acceptable level the competence of our own American teachers. We must not forget that they will be in frequent competition with foreign-born teachers to whom the language is native and ipso facto in at least reasonable shape.

We are naturally tempted in our policy statements on language teaching so to emphasize "native" facility, the use of the FL in virtually every context, etc., that we occasionally set up models to which only the foreign born can conform--or rather a goal in the attainment of which the American teacher is radically handicapped. If we were to take literally the aims of some policy statements, our school faculties in FL would be entirely "natives." In private language schools like Berlitz this is the case. Obviously the native speaker -- whom we want in our schools -- has a great many advantages. To put it one way, however, it would be paradoxical to establish standards under which he has <u>all</u> of them.

Less obviously, the American teacher has profound advantages of his own--always provided he can confirm and realize them by an adequate command of the foreign language he is teaching. The advantages lie particularly in two areas. The first is the acquaintance he has with the American educational system, with its students, and with the methods of instruction appropriate to it. This amounts to a certain "feel" for what is right, acceptable, or possible in our educational pattern. Foreign-born teachers often take a long time--some never reach the point at all--to understand the relationship the American teacher bears to the student and to the materials of his instruction. The second point is a subtle, but very important one: The American student seeing a native instructor in his language class may well recognize the facility with which the teacher speaks, but what does this amount to beyond redognizing the obvious? He realizes, of course, that this is a "native" ability, not an acquired one, and a native ability which the student in his period of instruction can only approximate. He is in a sense at a slightly unfair disadvantage, and the older he is the more he knows it. When he sees a well-qualified American teacher directing his language study, he is easily encouraged to emulate what the teacher has done: acquire for active and efficient use a language other than his mother tongue. This is precisely what the student should want to do, and it is a realizable goal. To repeat: All this does not imply rejection of the native as teacher. It demands our best efforts in raising the level of competence of our own young people going into language teaching--and a certain caution in setting up criteria. It is eminently clear that the sine qua non on the way to the goal is a period of residence and study abroad for

all of our FL teachers.

(By residence and study we mean not casual contact but systematic work. Too many European universities, for example, offer summer courses that are thinly disguised vacations. At least a substantial part of the teacher's period abroad should be in reputable and effective instructional contexts. A good example is the Goethe Institute for German.)

2. Arrangement of schedules to permit foreign study.

The arranging of a period of study abroad requires a certain flexibility in the time schedule of the students trained. We have agreed, however, that the methods course and the assignment of student teaching could be set at different times than presently obtains in order to free a suitable period for study abroad.

3. Use of our Foreign Study Centers in Europe, and other cooperative measures.

An ideal point of connection in this respect is the establishment by Indiana and Purdue of new centers at Hamburg, Strasbourg, and Madrid. Clearly if we can bring our students to these centers to further their active knowledge of the language we will have taken a great step forward.

The consortium arrangement which we now have with other universities in this area might also serve as encouragement or support for a project of this sort. Since our suggestion has international implications, it may be open to support by the funds given to the Consortium. This idea should be further explored.

The point can also be made that with reduced fares for group flights, for example, a whole year of study abroad may well be almost as cheap as a year of study in Indiana. If there is any difference it seems quite likely that most students would be willing to contibute something in return for the extraordinary advantages they would receive.

The question should also be explored whether we might not work together with the Armed Forces Program (now being considered) on details of cooperation as to transportation. There may be other areas of cooperative endeavor which could develop from this situation.

This is probably the point at which to mention an important caveat: We cannot expect indefinite and unlimited subsidization of such programs. Teachers and students should be willing to support themselves increasingly in such ventures. Our job is to make the programs available and to see that they are as inexpensive as possible.

4. Openings for part-time work and other activities abroad.

Not all programs for experience abroad need be exclusively in the form of study. There are several other possibilities including the chance to function as a Lektor or "reader" in the foreign country. European universities always make use of native foreign language speakers to work in their practical courses and classes. There is a constant demand for such people. The same is true of assistantships or exchange positions in the secondary schools of Europe. The Department of Health, Education, and Welfare has already sponsored some of these exchanges in established teaching posts.

There seems no reason why we can not arrange to have our students work in such positions abroad. It is also possible that this could be done at the centers of which we have just spoken, or in the schools of the surrounding areas. The whole subject is open to investigation.

A further possibility lies in teaching English to the students of the foreign country. Since problems of methodology are in many ways the same and since American methods in foreign language teaching have a great deal to commend them as far as modernity and efficiency are concerned, we feel that the Eurpoean or Latin American student and school could profit from this sort of opportunity. To a lesser extent, our teachers would also benefit.

A more unmixed benefit would proceed from participation in discussion and seminars on foreign language problems and methodology with the students and teachers of the countries involved. The organization of such colloquia could be one of the most pleasant tasks of any "counselor abroad."

5. Continuing courses in"language" and use of the foreign language in literary and cultural courses.

We recommend that the continuation of every one of the basic skills of language--speaking and listening, reading and writing--should characterize our courses in the four years of undergraduate work. This does not necessarily restrict itself to the presence or encouragement of "practical" courses in language but extends into the desirability of having literary and cultural courses given in the foreign tongue.

At present Indiana offers not only third year courses in conversation, writing, etc., but also sections of the 300-level Masterpiece courses expressly announced as "given in French," etc. Many schools do this, many do not. We urge other institutions preparing teachers to foster both goals: (1) "language" courses at every level including fourth year; (2) literary and cultural courses offered in the foreign language.

In fourth year courses Indiana offers advanced work in diction, stylistics, etc. appropriate to teachers. In literary courses it is realistic to say that more subtle or difficult aspects of critical theory or interpretation are often treated in English. It is not fair or wise to castigate this. Here and at the graduate level communication may become more important than adherence to a principle not <u>entirely</u> germane to the course. It is possible to concede this and yet not relax in our own effort to extend use of the language.

We must also not lose sight of the fact that, in this regard, the commonly offered languages differ substantially. It is clearly possible for Americans with similar training to converse about advanced or abstract concerns more readily in French than in Russian.

The requirement or recommendation of a full battery of advanced language courses remains an important area of concern. It seems clear that in departments here and elsewhere the image of literature courses is somewhat more favorable than that of the "practical" ones. In many there is <u>not</u> a full sequence of language courses. Some schools may run into difficulty simply because there is not enough staff or enough curriculum to arrange the continuity

of instruction we are talking about. Departments should be encouraged to survey carefully their language offerings (taken in the dual sense indicated above) and see to it that their teacher candidates get the fullest possible exposure.

6. . Consideration of other programs such as area studies.

It is possible to hold strongly to the great importance of literature as the ultimate expression of language and yet concede that many prospective teachers are more interested in a broad knowledge of a country and its ways (including its literature as a part thereof) than they are in a striaght literary major -- and that they would still make good teachers for our high schools and grade schools.

In this sense we propose a reevaluation of the modified concentration called in one department the "Language and Area Program." This program was to be made up of a major in German, with emphasis on practical courses, plus integrated courses in economics, geography, government, history, and philosophy. Such a major opens a whole area of great interest and concern to the language teacher. In the specific case alluded to it has, however, fallen into desuetude. There is no reason why it could not be revived and encouraged. We should certainly not abandon the requirement of literary courses for the major--literature is itself a prominent part of "culture and civilization" too--but we can at the same time encourage for some of our candidates the other sort of major, including, naturally, present courses like "German Civilization."

7. Encouragement of courses in other departments, taught in FL.

With the introduction, in departments such as Fine Arts and History, of courses taught in foreign languages, we should consider the possibility of including such courses in the program of teacher preparation and counting them toward certification. The idea seems perfectly valid, so long as the conducting of the course in the foreign language works out as successfully as it is hoped.

8. Extension of the Methods Course in the School of Education and organization in the FL departments of eight weeks courses for teachers.

When dedicated people in Education and equally dedicated members of language departments are working toward the same goal—in this case the preparation of well-qualified teachers—the more they cooperate the better. Certainly we have gone past the point where power rivalry makes any sense. The goals we set clearly demand, in the present context, "methods" courses that are (1) more inclusive and (2) shared.

An extraordinary breadth of material has to be covered in a sensible methods course: contrastive structures; linguistic phenomena; the psychology of language learning; the proper teaching of literature, culture, and language itself; the whole area of testing and measurement (one with which many teachers are unfamiliar); the complex of professional organizations and their structure; the help available from such organizations and from standard lists of materials; the whole range of devices used for teaching, all the way from tapes to programmed instruction; the areas of necessary experimentation and research in the use of these media; fields of

special competence in language needed to teach young people.

Much of this material is of common interest and relevance to prospective teachers of any language. This should be covered in the present methods course. But the mass of material is so great and expanding so fast that the three-credit course can scarcely contain it. We recommend an extension to four or five credits.

Not only in specific competence in French or Russian etc. do our prospective teachers require <u>departmentally</u> oriented work on "methods." Large areas of contrastive grammar--so essential to the proper teaching of everything from phonetics to syntax--can only be handled departmentally. Techniques of literary analysis, for example of a Spanish poem, need to be treated in the same fashion. And so on.

We recommend that every department follow the lead of French and institute an eight-weeks course in "The Teaching of _____ in Grade and High Schools" (or the equivalent), to precede the eight-weeks practice teaching assignment. This course should be required and would thus help in filling the (very large) hour requirement for teachers. We urge all parties concerned to recognize that the need for such courses transcends considerations of enrollment. Even if, to start with, the German and Russian courses have to be given for three or four students, they should be given.

In the relation of methodology to practice teaching, the closer the connection the better. It may well be that we should consider some redistribution of the practice teaching situation, for example, to allow both the eight-weeks methods course within the language department (v.s.) and the general methods course in Education

to precede the practice teaching assignment. This is oneof the more obvious considerations and yet very much an essential one. If the eight weeks course were inavoidably to <u>follow</u> the practice teaching assignment, its content should be modified.

9. Weekly seminars for practice teachers

Depending upon geographical factors, it might well be possible to organize seminars on Friday afternoon or evening, or on Saturday morning, bringing student teachers back to the campus for discussion of the work that they have been doing. The immediate contact should be a productive one. It is of course possible that geographical factors would preclude such an arrangement, particularly in the case of less frequently offered languages like Russian and German. In the latter case, there is a further experimental possibility which we should at least mention. This is the opportunity to use closed-circuit television coverage at the regional campuses which would be available to practice teachers at any high school in the area near the regional campus. Materials could be set up here in Bloomington and could be broadcast to the regional campuses. There the practice teachers would be required to gather and take notes and conduct discussions on issues presented. This would require a great deal of preparation, timing, and effort, but it may well be one of the possibilities open to us.

10. Temporary and permanent solutions to the problem of supervision.

The issue of supervision of practice teaching in the field, by a university specialist, arises in large part because of one fact which we must all acknowledge, namely that the "master teachers" who

are now helping our practice teachers are on occasion a good deal less than "masters." The use of a travelling foreign language specialist for the university would be a good solution but obviously a temporary one. What we truly want is the development of a well-qualified corps of supervisors who do not need any such auxiliary help. In this sense, the proposal of Mr. Leamon for a Master Teachers Institute would help us over the basic hurdle. The same is of course true for third level institutes and other experiences of an organized nature available to our advanced teachers.

11. Rationalizing of certification procedures.

It seems that we are moving toward a point where we shall regularly certify not only by courses taken but also by examination, using recognized national measuring devices. The advantages of time and efficiency are apparent. This university is now in a position where, if a department will attest that a student deserves a certain number of credits on the basis of background or work taken elsewhere, or of unusually superior qualifications, these credits will be accepted for certification. Not all institutions are doing this, however, and to some extent such a freer pattern may depend upon the presence of an advanced curriculum and a group of teachers who are familiar with testing and placement techniques.

In setting up examinations to measure skills in language we should use such devices as the MLA tests, but it is clear that we should concentrate entirely on <u>those</u> tests in the whole battery of MLA examinations which measure the basic abilities of the language, that is speaking, comprehension, reading, and writing. The tests on professional background, and so on, are much less immediately

germane and, we suspect, also much less reliable as indicators of the type of ability which we wish to measure and insist upon.

The ideal stage will be reached when we can present to principals seeking teachers not only a course and grade transcript but a list of scores (with interpretations thereof) on the MLA battery. It is our feeling that these tests should be required of all prospective teachers.

Certain special issues will arise when the first ten hours of language work are no longer counted for credit. It seems only reasonable to assume that a certain number of these hours will, nonetheless, be accepted toward accreditation. If we do not allow this, we will certainly have to change the requirements themselves. Further, in the period of immediate reorganization of certification requirements, it may well be that we shall want to reduce, temporarily at least, the number of hours actually involved in the requirement. This is particularly feasible, since we are planning to do a great deal of certification by testing devices and to rely somewhat less on demonstration of a prescribed number of units or courses.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Respectfully submitted,

H. Phillip Leamon, Coordinator for School Foreign Languages; Assistant Professor of Education

Arthur H. Oestreich, Director of the Division of University Schools, and Professor of Education

Philip Peak, Associate Dean of the School of Education, and Professor of Education

Frank G. Ryder, Chairman and Professor of German (Chmn.)

George E. Smith, Director of the Indiana Language Program, and Associate Professor of Spanish and Portuguese